

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, and 18-20 are presently pending. Claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 6, 11, and 16 are amended.

Examiner objected to Figure 1. Assignee has amended the specification and in view of the amendments to the specification, it is respectfully submitted that the objections to Figure 1 are overcome.

Claims 1 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Abe. Claims 1 and 11 recite, among other limitations, "Inverse filtering the portion of the audio signal with the plurality of linear prediction coefficients (LPC), thereby resulting in a residual signal".

Examiner has indicated that Abe teaches "inverse filtering the portion of the audio signal with the plurality of linear prediction coefficients (LPC), thereby resulting in a residual signal (Fig. 3, item 20 and related text)". Office Action at 4.

Abe, Fig. 3, item 20 merely discloses "Residual Energy Extraction", however, there is not teaching in Abe of "Inverse filtering the portion of the audio signal with the plurality of linear coefficients (LPC), thereby resulting in a residual signal". Accordingly, Assignee traverses the rejection to claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Abe, as well as the rejection to dependent claims 2-5 and 12-15.

Claims 4, 6 (as now amended), 14, and 16 (as now amended) recite, among other limitations, "decimating the frame, thereby causing the frame to comprise a predetermined number of samples". Examiner has indicated that Abe discloses "decimating the frame, thereby causing

the frame to comprise a predetermined number of samples (Fig. 2 and related text)." Office Action at 4.

Assignee respectfully submits that Figure 2 is merely "a schematic illustration of an operation of blocking an audio signal". Abe, Figure 2, does not teach, "decimating the frame" much less "causing the frame to comprise a predetermined number of samples". Accordingly, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection to claims 4 and 14 and requests that Examiner withdraw them. Additionally, Assignee respectfully requests that in view of the amendments to claims 6 and 16, Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 6 and 16.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, each of the pending claims is in a condition for allowance. Examiner is requested to pass this case to issuance.

Please charge any required fees not paid herewith or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,



Mirut Dalal
Registration No. 44,052
Attorney for Assignee

December 26, 2007

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000
FAX (312) 775-8100